

## REMARKS

The office action and the references cited therein have been carefully considered together with the present application and the specification and claims have been amended to place the application in condition for immediate allowance.

With regard to the objections that were made to the claims as set forth in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the office action, amendments have been made to claims 1, 3 and 5 in part to overcome the stated objections. It is believed that the objections have been traversed by these amendments to the claims.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notess in view of Fisher et al. (Fisher) further amendments have been made to independent claims 1, 16 and 17 to place the application in condition for immediate allowance. It is believed that the amendments to these independent claims emphasizes predetermined differences between the subject matter claimed and the prior art references and that the claims 1, 16 and 17 are neither taught nor suggested by Notess or Fisher, applied singularly or in combination with one another.

The examiner has admitted in part 6 of the office action that Notess does not specifically teach that the log manager is registered with the server for performing the function as mentioned. Initially, it should be stated that claim 1 is directed to a method for logging event data from at least one operable application program or at least one peripheral device operably connected in a network to a server using a log manager device driver, the logged event data comprising a log manager file that can be used to perform network diagnostics and troubleshooting which comprises the stated steps of the claim.

Notess is not directed to a method for logging event data for the purpose of performing network diagnostics and troubleshooting as is set forth in the preamble. While the examiner has admitted that Notess fails to specifically teach that the log manager is registered with the server, the examiner also ignores the specific functions that are carried out in the two registering steps. First, the step of registering said log

manager device driver with said server is done to receive all incoming event data. Additionally, the step of registering said log manager device driver with said server has a device driver for said log manager file. Not only does Notess not specifically teach a log manager being registered with a server, it certainly does not do so for the purpose set forth in the two separate registering steps.

Additionally, Notess does not teach or suggest the step of responding to a download request for said log manager file requesting computer by said log manager device driver so that said requesting computer can use said log manager file to perform diagnostic or troubleshooting activities. Notess appears to accumulate statistical data for use by a management node for displaying the data in various ways. There is no discussion that indicates that log event data is used to perform the network diagnostics and troubleshooting as is specifically set forth in claim 1. Thus, the specific steps as well as the preamble clearly differentiate the claim from Notess.

Moreover, Fisher fails to provide the deficiencies of Notess for the reason that the Apple event manager described in column 6 text of Fisher that was identified by the examiner registers a process known as an event handler that operates to detect predefined events which when detected forwards the events to the registered handlers and cause the handlers to be invoked and service the events. This is a description of apparatus which performs the active operation of application programs rather than logging event data that is used to perform network diagnostics and troubleshooting. Neither of the words "diagnostics" or "troubleshooting" appears anywhere in the text of either Notess or Fisher. Thus, it is believed that neither Notess or Fisher applied separately or in combination teach or suggest amended claim 1, and reconsideration and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested.

Since the dependent claims necessarily incorporate the subject matter of the claims from which they depend and in addition recite other features or functionality not found in those independent claims, it is believed that these claims are in condition for allowance. Since claims 16 and 17 have been amended to incorporate

subject matters similar to that which has been added to claim 1, the arguments that have been advanced above with regard to claim 1 also apply to claims 16 and 17.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims presenting pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

  
Roger D. Greer  
Registration No. 26,174

March 24, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978